

The caBIG compatibility document

Since my comments are more general in nature, it makes more sense for me to send them this way as opposed to annotating the document.

In light of Warren's approach for providing a validation suite of tools for certifying compatibility, the document makes more sense if approached as such:

The four areas of compatibility are good (though some are less weighty than others). The vocabulary compatibility will have real meaning when verified with the interface integration area however. ***The levels of compliance should be independently applied to each of these compatibility areas.*** Thus an application could be gold in Information Models, but bronze in Interface Integration, and vice versa.

When doing software verification/validation, systems can be verified in different ways, the two extremes being by 1) inspection (looking at the code or design documents) and 2) test (this means designing software/ hardware tests to verify specific functions/data). Indeed the Interface Integration (with overlap into the vocabulary area) can/should be done using the test method (which is obviously the most rigorous form of verification).

In order to specify tests for the Interface Integration (II) area, requirements need to be captured, because these requirements are what the tests will be designed to verify. Requirements should be specified to define what data needs to move in/out of functions within the CT (and each) workspace, and also to move data between all of the workspaces that make up caBIG. Failure to spec the interface requirements will result in tests that are meaningless...most likely the tests will end up testing what you know works, not what should work).

The compatibility document should address a minimum set of Interface Integration tests within each workspace and certainly inter-workspace. It is at the Interface Integration level where the caBIG compatibility certification has meaning, because obviously, moving data around is where the rubber hits the road.